

Options Discussion

Potential Options

- Keep Idaho's Current Criteria/Uses
- Adopt & Implement EPA Region 10
- Develop Site-Specific Criteria
- Other Potential Natural Vegetation (PNV)



Keep Current Criteria/Uses

Pros:

- Change could be costly and ineffective

- Least cost in short-term
 Change could be costly
 Oversight agencies question protectiveness
 - Does not reflect Idaho's thermal diversity
 - Wilderness/unimpaired waters do not meet
 - Attainability questioned
 - Outdated metrics and
 - EPA likely to promulgate regional temperature criteria

Adopt & Implement **EPA Region 10 Guidance**

Pros:

- More protective of fish in some waters

 Less attainable than current criteria
- Could reduce future "false Large undertaking to
- positive" 303(d) listings Would alleviate political pressure from oversight agencies
- Single metric approach is easier to implement
- More recent science

- current criteria
- replace aquatic uses
- Requires additional data collection
- Could be very costly

Develop Site-Specific Criteria

- Tailored to Idaho's geography and environment
- Potentially employs latest science
- Could recognize local thermal potential and natural variability

- EPA may question protectiveness
- Very costly
- Costs multiply if broken into smaller areas or regions
- EPA approval/ESA consultation required for each application (~decade)
- End result may not differ much from EPA guidance

Other - Potential Natural Vegetation (PNV)

- Approach usually works
- Helps habitat and other aspects of stream health
- More understandable and accepted methodology

- Does not work if factors other than shade reduction are an issue
- Interest groups may oppose DEQ's foray into land management

Reminder of Ground Rules:

- Constructive dialogue
- Active participation
- Begin and end on time
- No dominating the discussion
- Respect opinions
- Leave rank at the door
- No side conversations/cell phones
- Focus on open exchange of ideas